

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

ALDERWOOD SURGICAL CENTER, LLC,  
a Washington limited liability company;  
NORTHWEST NASAL SINUS CENTER  
P.S., a Washington professional service  
corporation, and JAVAD A. SAJAN, M.D.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C22-1835RSM

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
OVERLENGTH BRIEFING AND  
GRANTING LEAVE TO FILE  
SECOND DISPOSITIVE MOTION

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff State of Washington's Motion for Leave to File Over-length Dispositive Motion. Dkt. #85. A Motion for summary judgment is typically limited to 8,400 words. LCR 7(e)(3). Plaintiff asks to file "up to 12,600 words." *Id.* at 2.

"Motions seeking approval to file an over-length motion or brief are disfavored..." LCR 7(f).

Plaintiff's Motion states: "additional words are necessary to fully address the multiple claims which are now ripe for summary judgment. The State's claims include both state and federal law, and involve numerous instances of misconduct spanning at least seven years.

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR OVERLENGTH BRIEFING AND GRANTING LEAVE  
TO FILE SECOND DISPOSITIVE MOTION - 1

1 Additional space for briefing is necessary to fully address the numerous claims that may be  
2 readily disposed of prior to trial.” Dkt. #85 at 2. No further detail is provided.

3 While it may be true that this case involves several causes of action and issues, such  
4 could be said for most of the Court’s cases. Parties typically have no difficulty moving for  
5 summary judgment within the 8,400 word limit. Plaintiff has already peeled off one set of  
6 issues in a separate dispositive motion, still pending before the Court. *See* Dkt. #35. Plaintiff  
7 offers no further detail, *e.g.*, what claims or facts are at issue. The Court concludes that Plaintiff  
8 has failed to justify a departure from the Local Rules on briefing length.

9 Absent leave of the court, a party must not file contemporaneous dispositive motions,  
10 each one directed toward a discrete issue or claim. LCR 7(e). Plaintiff also requests leave to  
11 file a second dispositive motion in order to comply with this local rule. The Court finds that  
12 such is warranted given the procedural history of this case.

13 Having reviewed the Motion and the remainder of the record, the Court hereby finds and  
14 ORDERS that Plaintiff State of Washington’s Motion for Leave to File Over-length Dispositive  
15 Motion, Dkt. #85, is DENIED. Plaintiff is otherwise granted leave to file a second dispositive  
16 motion.

17 DATED this 25<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2024.

18  
19 

20 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
22  
23  
24